

17155

ED3.N: 970

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Government Documents
Collection
APR 09 1971
University of Massachusetts

1970

General Laws Relating to Education

Chapter 15 - Section 1H

"The council shall annually, on or before the first Monday of November, report to the governor its findings and plans regarding the co-ordination, effectiveness, and efficiency of public education programs and systems in the commonwealth."

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

William C. Gaige
Director of Research

MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111

1970

Printed as a Public Service by the
Raytheon Company

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT

Table of Contents

		<u>Page</u>
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	STATE SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION	4
	A. Economic Indicators of Comparative Effort and Equity Related to Elementary and Secondary Education	4
	B. State Aid to Education - Analysis	6
III	STATE LEADERSHIP	8
	A. Fiscal Flexibility for the Three Top Boards	9
	B. Other Conditions for State Leadership	10
	C. Control of Organization	10
	D. Relationships Between Elementary-Secondary Education and Higher Education: The Function of Commissions	11
	E. Critical Needs for State Leadership	14
	1. The State Department of Education	14
	2. Business Management of School Systems	14
	3. Teacher Certification and Education	16
	4. Occupational Education	16
	5. Adult Education	17
	6. Pupil Personnel Services	18
	7. Education of the Culturally Deprived	19
	8. Education of the Emotionally Handicapped	20
	9. The Boston School System	21
IV	AN EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENT	23
V	PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION	26
VI	STUDIES UNDER WAY	29

	<u>Page</u>
VII PROBLEMS AND PLANS FOR 1972	31
A. Studies in 1972	31
Studies Contracted for Fiscal 1968-70	34

I INTRODUCTION

The Advisory Council on Education has four functions - nominating to the Governor three persons to fill each vacancy on the Boards of Education, Higher Education and Trustees of State Colleges, planning and mounting studies, participating in those studies, and seeking to assure that the findings of its studies are known and their recommendations implemented. Limited by law to three professionals, the Council does not conduct its own research; rather it engages the ablest scholars and leaders it can recruit from wherever they come, brings them into consultation with key persons who operate in the area to be studied, and following the preparation of the study plan, appropriates the required funds and appoints an advisory study committee to work with the study directors. The studies are usually housed and routinely administered in universities.

The Council does have difficult problems, some of which are described in this report. However, the activities of three professionals and their governing board are limited and not in themselves of great interest. The Council's chief function is to conduct studies. The Council speaks to the Commonwealth largely through those studies. Thus most of this annual report deals with certain of the findings and recommendations of some of its studies - all of the recent ones. The Council must rest its case as a new, unique state education agency on the excellence and value of its studies, and its future will be determined by the impact that those studies have upon the course and quality of our public elementary and secondary schools and our public colleges and universities in the next few years.

It is the problem of the impact of its studies which concerns the Council most. The Council is an independent state agency coordinate with the Boards of Education and Higher Education. By the very reason that the Council is free to conduct whatever studies it judges needed in the manner that it chooses, it is appropriate that the Council has no operating authority over any of the Boards or school committees of the State. It is limited to informing, recommending and influencing. In addition to the nature and quality of the studies, it is of overriding importance that the Council establish close communication and good relationships with the other boards and with the Governor and the Legislature. Then too the Council is a state agency charged with examining the systems of education in the state as a whole. It is therefore essential to the improvement of education across the state that the state education boards and their staffs be strong and effective, in their leadership and services and that the State itself contribute a sufficient portion of the costs of elementary and secondary education so distributed as to assure sufficient resources to each community. It is for these last reasons that so much of this annual report speaks to the nature and condition of state leadership in education and to the relationship of state support for education, as well as to the economic condition of education.

Thus this report speaks largely though by no means completely, to the condition of education in the Commonwealth. It describes activities of a manner, scope and a continuity never before attempted by a state government. Under its legislative prerogative "to issue public reports on education matters it is concerned with", the Council will issue in the spring a special report prepared by a competent writer of the view of Massachusetts Education as projected by the studies of the Council to date.

A. The Council and the Reorganization of State Government

In its third Annual Report the Council noted the impending reorganization of state government which includes the appointment of a Secretary for Educational Affairs. It pointed out that the traditional organization of education in Massachusetts, as in most states, places authority for the governance of education under boards. It asked "whether a careful examination of the unique structure and functions of education in the Commonwealth should not be made in relation to the proposed plan for governmental reorganization". Such an examination has been conducted as a result of a grant from the State Office of Program Planning and Coordination to the Massachusetts Education Conference Board. The Board in turn engaged Dr. Paul Cook of Massachusetts Institute of Technology to examine the status of governance of education, to interview a wide range of educators and those engaged in or related to education and to make recommendations.

In October Dr. Cook issued his report The Job of the Secretary for Educational Affairs. His conclusions are that education needs a Secretary for Educational Affairs who, operating in the sources of administrative power, can see that education's need are clearly understood and met. Such a secretary would not take over the responsibilities of the Boards; rather he would act as a manager and coordinator who strengthens the hand of education at all levels.

The situation of the Advisory Council seems to be sufficiently unique to comment upon. The Willis-Harrington Commission conceived of the Council, not as an executive function, but as a legislative one. It was to have had legislators as members as did the Commission. Constitutional considerations prohibited legislative membership. In consequence the Council requested the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to appoint four members each to a Legislative Consulting Committee. While members of this committee have been helpful advisors to the Council and some have attended many of the Council's meetings, the committee as a whole has not substituted for the active membership of legislators on the original commission. Close relations of the Council with the Legislature have not yet been achieved. As the Council along with the other boards comes under the control of the new Secretary for Educational Affairs, one thing has become clear. The function of the original Commission and of the Council is an essential one. Thorough, unbiased studies made by the ablest experts obtainable are necessary to effective administration and wise planning. Questions then arise as to whether the Council

will continue its entirely independent roll, whether it will establish close working and planning relations with the new Secretary for Educational Affairs - sufficiently close to furnish the Secretary with the information he wants and needs without duplication -- or whether the Council's function will pass to the Office of the Secretary, the Director of Research and his staff being transferred to the Office of the Secretary or replaced by an assistant or associate secretary for research.

II STATE SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Two major themes have emerged from the Council's studies dealing with elementary and secondary education. Culminating with the Study of the State Department of Education and the Report of the Massachusetts Business Task Force for School Management, most of these studies have underlined the over-reliance on the local property tax to support schools and the resulting critical inequalities of educational opportunities. All have underlined deficiencies in state leadership and the overriding necessity to strengthen and extend it. The major part of this annual report deals with the economics of our education, and then at some length it outlines the problems of and the need for state leadership as derived from the reports of nine studies.

A. Economic Indicators of Comparative Effort and Equity Related to Elementary and Secondary Education

There is not clear evidence that the quality of education is directly related to the money spent upon it and that quality education in turn is directly related to the economic health and the social welfare of the Commonwealth. One can only make the empirical judgment that money is related to the quality and scope of education as it is to the quality of systems of transportation, communication, and health services.

The economic indicators reported below and considerable that follows in this report do present evidence that public elementary and secondary education is not receiving the resources or the commitment that its importance to our youth and our society require. Any one of the indicators may not be accurate, but taken all together, they suggest that our citizens and leaders should reappraise their priorities and support. Most of the following relationships are reported in Rankings of the States, 1970, published by the Research Bureau of the National Education Association.

Massachusetts is a wealthy state. Its per capita personal income in 1968 ranked it 8th among the states. Because it has a relatively small population of school age children its personal income per school age child ranks it 5th among the states.

The following rankings indicate that the State's effort to support elementary and secondary education are not commensurate with its relative wealth. The State's per capita expenditures for local and state schools in 1968 ranked it 34th among the states and 50th in the percent of which its total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools are of its total personal income in 1968-69. Massachusetts does rank low -- 43rd in the percentage of school age children in public schools. But in 1969-70, the per pupil expenditure for those pupils who are in public schools ranked Massachusetts 21st among the states. There is another disturbing figure, the estimated percent of increase in current expenditures per pupil from 1960 to 1970 ranks Massachusetts 35th. The State's average salary of teachers of

\$8700, in 1969-70 ranked it 18th, and the increase of 5.4 percent in the instructional staff salaries of 1969-70 over 1968-69 ranked Massachusetts 42nd among the states.

Massachusetts citizens do pay high taxes - fifth highest in the total per capita taxes paid in 1968, but as a percent of personal income of all local and state revenue, Massachusetts ranked 30th, in comparative effort. While the per capita and per pupil efforts reported above for elementary and secondary education are low, the state ranks high and assigns high priority to several other services of government. The total per capita expenditures for local and state services in 1967-68 rank Massachusetts first in fire protection, fifth in health and hospitals, fifth in welfare, and tenth in police protection.

Perhaps two reasons for the low support picture that is sketched above are the overwhelming reliance of public elementary and secondary education upon the local property tax for support and the strong tradition of local autonomy and the resulting absence of and support for strong state planning, services and leadership. In 1967-68 Massachusetts ranked third highest in the percent of which its per capita property tax is of all revenues supporting state and local government. It ranked second highest in the percentage of which its per capita local property taxes are of revenues for local government. In 1969-70 it ranked third highest in the percent of which the support of elementary and secondary education comes from local government. On the other hand, in 1969-70 Massachusetts ranked 47th in the percent of revenue for elementary and secondary schools that was contributed by the state.

The result of low state support and high reliance on the local property tax, and to an extent, the absence of strong state leadership and services, is the inability of many communities to support a decent quality of education while paying some of the highest tax rate in the State. While the average expenditures per pupil in Massachusetts in 1968-69 was \$639, 39 school systems spent less than \$600.00 per pupil -- one less than \$500.00. At the other end of the scale 55 cities and towns spend more than \$900.00 per pupil. The highest was more than \$1566.

In the 1969 session the General Court wisely provided for the combining of the education aid fund and the general aid fund and for the full funding of the education equalization aid formula. This action did not provide more funds for local communities, but it did provide that State funds amounting to about 23% of local education costs should be distributed largely on the basis of need. As this report is completed, the press reports that the Master Tax Commission will recommend to the Governor and the Legislature an increase in state revenue to be distributed to make possible the reduction of the local property taxes by an average of 14 percent. Such relief would surely benefit the level of school funding, but the inequities and levels of funding are such that a considerable portion of the increased state revenue should be channeled to the local communities through the education equalization aid program. While some, including

the former Commissioner of Education, recommend that the State take over the entire funding of education, as it has of welfare, the consensus of informed opinion across the country indicates that state funding should increase to at least fifty percent of school costs distributed on a basis that will assure a reasonable level of support for education at a reasonable local tax rate.

B. State Aid to Education - An Analysis

As this annual report is issued, the Council is also releasing a report comprising a summary of its studies of the economics of education, an extended history of state aid in Massachusetts and an analysis of that aid and the political economic and educational issues involved. The State Dollar and the Schools is written by Mrs. Charlotte Ryan, Chairman of the Education Conference Board, the organization which played so large a role in attaining passage of the present equalization aid program.

Mrs. Ryan presents a clear history of state aid to education in Massachusetts and an analysis of the present program and describes a number of modifications which were made for political expediency and which frustrate its equalizing factors even when fully funded. Known as the NESDEC formula the program aims to give each community a varying percentage of its local education effort in accordance with its ability to support its education program at tax rates comparable to these of other communities supporting similar programs. In its pure form without limitations the formula would truly equalize; it correlates 97% with community need. Unfortunately, a number of limitations have been placed on the program. First, providing only an average of 23% of the cost of elementary and secondary education, it has not been fully funded. It was designed to provide an average of 35%. A year ago the Legislature voted to fund fully the equalizing education aid formula, but did so by transferring the support from the general aid fund. This provided more equalization but not more funds. Second, a ceiling was placed on the expenditures to which aid could be applied at 110% of the state average. This reduced entitled aid for wealthy communities with minimal state aid and cut aid to communities of moderate wealth that made more than normal effort. Third, all towns are reimbursed for 80% of the average state expenditure whether they equal it, or indeed whether they use the unentitled aid for education. Fourth, the previous year's aid is deducted from expenditures that are reimbursed, reducing effective reimbursement by a quarter and hurting less able towns more than the able. Fifth it was provided that all communities no matter how wealthy should receive a minimum state aid of 15% and that all towns no matter how poor should receive not more than 75% state aid. Finally, it was provided in a "save-harmless clause" that when the new program was adopted no community should suffer a loss in state aid by the change.

Each of these changes has reduced the correlation with need, and there are other factors. When the formula was proposed it was

intended that it apply to all education programs. However at present two catagorical education aid programs and aid to regional districts are not included. They are vocational education and special education automatically funded at 50%. This can be a hardship to poor communities that would gain more than 50%, but obviously a boom to wealthier communities. At present any community receives a 15% additional reimbursement for all of its education programs if any part of its student population attends a regional school. Altogether, these non-equalizing aids will aggregate \$35,000,000 for 1970, a substantial offset to the equalizing effect of the \$200,000,000 distributed in general aid. In addition, \$18,000,000 will be distributed as aid to transportation which should be reconstructed on an equalizing basis.

Mrs. Ryan's analyses and those of the studies she summarizes indicate that a state support level for education of at least fifty percent is essential to assure the ability of all communities to support programs at a satisfactory level, to assure equality of educational opportunity to all children and youth and to reduce the serious overburden on the local property tax.

III STATE LEADERSHIP

Education is a state function and requires state leadership. Massachusetts was the first state to establish an agency of state control and leadership when it created the State Department of Education in 1838 and appointed Horace Mann as the first commissioner. In recent years such distinguished leaders as James B. Conant, John Gardner, and Terry Sanford have recognized that the growing importance, cost and complexity of education require that the States assume a much more forceful leadership role vis a vis both federal and local governments. The creation of the Education Commission of the States and the formation of state compact councils has resulted.

A considerable portion of this report will deal with the quality and problems of State leadership as they are revealed by eight of the Council's studies and as that leadership is exercised by the Board of Education and supplemented and supported by the organizations related to elementary and secondary education. A brief statement about the status and leadership of public higher education is at the end of this section.

In May, 1969, the Council commissioned Dr. John S. Gibson of Tufts University to conduct a study of the State Department of Education in collaboration with the Massachusetts Education Conference Board. Dr. Gibson presented his report to the Council on June 17. That Report and the findings of the Council's other studies presented below reveal that the extent of state leadership and services is insufficient, and in a number of instances leadership and services do not exist at all.

It would be simple but unjust to blame the Board of Education, the Commissioner and the Department staff. The fact is that the Board of Education, of which the Director of the Council is an ex officio member, is a group of able, conscientious, intelligent laymen who devote far more of their time than the required monthly meetings. They are deeply concerned about the rigidities and the lack of funding which prevent the Department from setting standards and providing sufficient leadership and services. The Board itself is taking initiative in directing the establishment of a new set of policy guidelines which will lead to better management practices. And there are segments within the Department which provide able and strong leadership across a considerable portion of the state, and members of the Department of Education who are of great assistance to the school systems whom they serve.

The basic problems of state leadership in Massachusetts education lie in deep-seated institutional traditions such as privatism and localism and the resulting attitudes of our citizens. These in turn have resulted in failure of the Legislators, who do represent their constituencies, to support strong state education leadership and services and to afford the freedom and the financial support required for a strong State Department of Education.

Indeed there is a question of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. History and the evidence of the Council's studies present the view that the chicken, Massachusetts society, had better lay a larger and healthier product -- demand for and support for state leadership.

A. Fiscal Flexibility for the Three Top Boards

All public education -- school committees and operating boards of state colleges and universities, representing annual expenditures nearing \$1,400,000,000 have fiscal autonomy or a large degree of it. Only the Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education and the Advisory Council on Education, the top state leadership and operating agencies whose budgets represent less than 4/10 of 1% of total expenditures for public education, are excluded. The reasons are overriding for the Board of Education in particular, with its 340 professional employees, and the Board of Higher Education and the Advisory Council to have the fiscal autonomy enjoyed by the remainder of public education.

Education, with its commitment to freedom of thought and creative enterprise, is closest of all activities of government to our system of free private enterprise. Indeed a considerable portion of the education system is private. Of course, public education must share with other public enterprises in the determination by the Legislature of that portion of public funds allotted to it. But once the determination of the portion of public funds is made, and provisions are made for accounting for them, the publicly elected or appointed school committees and boards, working with their professional staffs, are best able to determine the priorities for the expenditures and the professional qualifications and salaries required to compete with private enterprises and private education in the market place. The absence of this freedom and authority for the Board of Education, in particular, results in unfilled positions, poorly qualified staff, waste and inefficiency. At present the three Boards operate not as integral parts of the great system of fiscally independent school committees and operating public college boards, but as part of the state governing mechanism in association with state departments whose functions and relationships are entirely different.

The first recommendation of Dr. Gibson's State Department of Education Study is that the Board of Education should have complete authority in hiring, retaining and promoting its own staff. It is significant that only a few weeks later the thirty-three loaned corporation executives constituting the Business Task Force for School Management made the same recommendation their first priority. The Massachusetts Education Conference Board, which collaborated in the State Department Study, is now attempting with others to organize support for the legislation for fiscal independence or flexibility -- legislation that has failed in the last two sessions. The Council strongly recommends that when enacted this legislation include the Board of Higher Education and hopes that it will include the

Advisory Council on Education. The Council is grateful to the Governors and the Legislature that it has had the freedom within the limits of its appropriation to determine what studies it shall conduct, who shall conduct them and how much they will cost.

B. Other Conditions for State Leadership

Quite obviously fiscal autonomy or flexibility, though basic, is only one requirement for the improvement of state leadership for elementary and secondary schools. It will assure only that the State Board of Education can do an effective job in some of the areas of its responsibility, and it can do this only if it has a clear set of goals, priorities and plans for carrying them out. It will then need increased financial support and a reorganized, streamlined Department -- an organization that is less rigidly bureaucratic which can form and reform itself into task forces to tackle one problem after another.

C. Control of Organization

While the Board of Education seeks to gain more funding and addresses itself to planning and reorganization, it does not have full control over how its Department is organized. As recommended by the Willis-Harrington Commission, the Department's eleven divisions were consolidated into five. Several former divisions were renamed bureaus and placed within the Division of Curriculum and Instruction under an associate commissioner. The first two of the Council's studies on teacher certification and teacher education and on vocational education found the bureau organization inadequate for the enterprises that they envisaged and recommended that the respective bureaus be elevated to divisions under assistant commissioners. A bill creating a Division of Occupational Education under an associate commissioner passed in the 1970 session of the Legislature, and in the closing moments of that session the Legislature upgraded the Bureau of Special Education into a division under an associate commissioner. The Council's study of Adult Education recommends a Division of Adult Education; the Council's study of Pupil Personnel Services recommends the bringing together of the scattered pupil services into a bureau which in five years would become a division. The Bureau of Library Extension is currently seeking division status. However, the largest and most important bureau in the Department is the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. The importance, scope and number of professionals in the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education logically require that it also become a division.

Unfortunately, the status of the various functions and operating agencies in the Department is not determined by importance and priority and recommended according to plan by the Board of Education. The Board itself did not introduce or originally support either the bills for vocational education or special education. Rather, only those functions that have the most active and well organized political support across the state are able to achieve elevated status. This situation

destroys the comprehensive concept of a unified system of education appropriately related in all of its objectives and parts. Vocational education, special education, pupil services, adult education, teacher certification and education - all of these are part of the concept and structure of curriculum and instruction. The study of the State Department of Education asserts that they belong under the general administration and coordination of the Associate Commissioner for Curriculum and Instruction. If the original concept of bureaus and sections had been adequate and adequately staffed, then new divisions would not have been necessary and should have been avoided. If there had been sufficient foresight, planning and coordination, only those functions which should become divisions would have been headed by assistant commissioners under the Associate Commissioner for Curriculum and Instruction. Perhaps now the only viable answer is to elevate the Associate Commissioner of Curriculum and Instruction to the status of a second Deputy Commissioner or some other appropriate title and again to unify all functions of instruction under him.

These matters are reported to illustrate the need to vest authority for planning in the State's education boards. The form and quality of educational leadership should not be determined in the Legislature by the introduction and passage of unrelated legislation, not initiated or supported by a State education agency.

D. Relationships Between Elementary-Secondary Education and Higher Education: The Function of Commissions

Having considered unifying control of all education under one board, the Willis-Harrington Commission settled on the creation of a second board to coordinate public higher education. It then concluded that its function of viewing all education from outside the limits of operating agencies should become permanent. It thus recommended the establishment of the Advisory Council on Education, and in the Legislation that created it, emphasized coordination through planning, informing and influencing. Most of the Council's studies of elementary and secondary education have addressed themselves to the need for the services and resources of higher education. The following comments are relevant to the undeniable and important relationships which exist between lower and higher education and to the almost entire absence of appropriate plans and agencies for clarifying, planning and strengthening those relationships.

The Council's first major study, that on teacher certification and teacher education, identified the weaknesses in the State's teacher certification program and in the teacher education programs in the colleges and universities and the relationships between the two functions. It became clear that the problems are complex and that a three way partnership of school systems and their administrators and teachers, college professors and state leadership would be required to solve them. The question is how to organize and assure efficient functioning of this team.

Legal authority for teacher certification must remain vested in the State, either in the Board of Education or the Board of Higher Education, and teacher education programs must remain the legal responsibility of the colleges and universities. And yet school systems and teachers in the classrooms play a major role in in-service education of teachers and student teaching. Advisory committees had been tried in a number of areas. Except in their early months, they have been ineffective and usually unused. As teacher certification and education are fully as much the province of higher education as of elementary and secondary education, and in order to include school systems and the teaching profession in the two processes, Dr. Stiles and his associates recommended the establishment by the legislature of a commission within the State Department of Education, with its membership and the manner of its appointment spelled out in the legislation along with the minimum number of meetings and the commission's relationship to the Department of Education. Final authority remained with the Board of Education after it had received the recommendations of the commission. This commission would assure the participation of the higher education boards and institutions and of the teaching profession. Upon funding, the State Department becomes a partner with the others in setting certification standards and in operating student teaching programs.

So far certification legislation has failed to be adopted, though California has established such a commission. Concurrently with the Teacher Certification study, the Council conducted its Study of Vocational Education. Drs. Schaefer and Kaufman went further and recommended a Division of Manpower Research and Development jointly administered by the Department of Education and the Department of Labor. So far there has been little support for this action, but committees of the Council working during and after the vocational education study recommended a commission similar to that of the teacher education study. While the attempt to gain teacher certification legislation failed, the effort to upgrade the Bureau of Vocational Education to the status of a division and to establish a commission within the Department of Education was successful.

The Commission on Occupational Education is in operation. The law establishing the Commission reads, in part:

"There is hereby established the commission for occupational education which shall consist of sixteen members, six to be appointed by the board of higher education, and ten to be appointed by the board of education.

Of the members to be appointed by the board of higher education one shall be a member of the board of higher education; one shall be a member of the board of community colleges; one shall be a member of the board of state colleges; one shall be a member skilled in technological training for industry; one shall be a member representing comprehensive education; and one shall be a member skilled and active in the field of occupational teacher-training.

Of the members to be appointed by the board of education one shall be a member of the board of education; one shall be a member representing the department of labor; one shall be a member of the Massachusetts Council for Vocational-Technical Education; one shall be a member representing industry having specialized knowledge of the employment needs for semiskilled, skilled and technically trained personnel; one shall be a member familiar with special problems of disadvantaged and handicapped persons; one shall be a member or organized labor; one shall be a member engaged in teaching in the field of vocational and technical education; one shall be a member active in the field of business and office education; one shall be a member skilled and experienced in the field of industrial arts education; and one shall be a member skilled in the field of home economics education."

The commission, therefore, is broadly representative. Other sections of the law are specific about its functions thus helping to assure a responsive and effective commission reporting to the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education.

Its activities in less than a year, culminating in an all day invitational conference on the Schaefer-Kaufman recommendations, give promise that the three way partnership of the profession, the colleges and the state leadership (the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges, Board of Education and its Department) is well underway.

The Adult Education Study of the Council recommends a commission "modeled along the lines of the recently established Commission on Occupational Education". A commission will be recommended by the Council's study of school district organization supported by the Business Task Force. It is probable that commissions would assure the necessary coordination and policy inputs in such fields as special education, education of the culturally deprived, early childhood, elementary and secondary education, and higher education in its various parts. Every effort should be made to assure that one commission in each area serves all of the levels, organizations and functions. Commissions should coordinate and serve both the Boards of Education and Higher Education.

The growing complexity of the processes and structure of education and the need for the various components in those processes to be effectively involved, demand the creation of some legally based organization such as the commissions described above. Or all education will need to be brought together under one powerful centralized state agency such as the Board of Regents in New York State whose University of the State of New York comprehends all education, higher and lower, public and private.

E. Critical Needs for State Leadership

This section on State Leadership so far has touched upon the need for fiscal autonomy or flexibility, the emerging unplanned reorganization of the State Department of Education, and the need for and development of legally established coordinating and quasi-governing commissions, particularly applicable to the relationships between higher and lower education. Action by the Governor, but most particularly by the Legislature, is required in all three of these matters.

Indeed the State Department of Education Study lays firmly at the Governor's door a major responsibility for leadership and upon the Legislature a responsibility for freeing the education agencies of operational restrictions and for supporting the proposals of the Boards. Massachusetts has had many outstanding governors who have distinguished themselves through leadership in one or another of the functions of government. It has had no governor who has seen the needs of education as a whole and who has set education as a top priority and given it outstanding state leadership in the degree that did former Governors Terry Sanford of North Carolina, Earl Warren of California or Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York.

Having discussed general conditions and directions required to assure strong state leadership, this report now turns to critical specific conditions reported in nine of the Council's studies which require state services and leadership. In order to avoid duplication at a later point, the listing from the studies of recommendations for state leadership includes some of the principal findings and recommendations as they relate directly to school systems, citizens and state leaders.

1. The State Department of Education. Other recommendations of the Study of the State Department of Education are that the Department must redirect and strengthen its management and undertake a number of reforms with respect to its internal operations; that strong efforts should be undertaken to increase the Department's service role to school systems and to minimize the functions of the Department as a regulator and enforcement agency. Present regional offices of the Department should be strengthened to deliver school services of quality directly to school systems. Two more centers should be established, one serving the greater Boston area. The Department should launch a program to establish educational goals for Massachusetts students, assessment of student achievement with respect to those goals, evaluation of schools, and accountability by educators and educational decision makers to the public.

2. Business Management of School Systems. The Council received one of its most impressive, valuable and hopeful studies at its September, 1970 meeting when the Massachusetts Business Task Force for School Management made its report. The study speaks authoritatively and with extraordinary impact because it was made by thirty-three top corporation managers who spent three months full time studying the

management operations of Massachusetts' school systems. They visited approximately half of them.

The Task Force estimates that if its recommendations are implemented for both operating and building programs, including school district cooperation, that savings over the next few years could aggregate 10% or up to \$100,000,000 a year. The institutional and political processes being what they are, it is unlikely that all these savings can be effected, but surely our citizens and their leaders are capable of effecting appreciable changes which would result in savings of at least a quarter to a third of the total potential.

As the chief thrust of this annual report deals with state leadership, the Task Force speaks here directly on matters related to state responsibility and leadership.

1. "The Task Force estimates that the Department of Education will need an additional appropriation of approximately \$1.1-million to engage the professional staff and the services necessary to carry out its very essential role in the implementation effort."
2. "Inescapably, conditions today require more cooperation between school systems and on a larger scale than has been envisioned in Massachusetts. Methods of achieving this vary, but regardless of method, the Department of Education must provide a unified policy and adequate communications."
3. "There is also a need for a centrally administered information system involving the coordinated efforts of the Office of Planning and Program Coordination, the Department of Education, as well as users and contributors of educational information."
4. "Manpower is an indispensable and critical resource for education. The Department of Education, as presently funded and organized, cannot make the fullest and most effective use of this resource and is not in a position to implement many of the recommendations in this report. The General Court should fund this department adequately and give it the authority to select, compensate, and classify its professional staff within the overall limits of its budget."
5. "Assuming that adequate funding is made available, the department should establish an expanded Bureau of School Management Services... The department should also appoint a professional administrator in the Office of the Commissioner to direct departmental communications and to plan and execute a long-range public relations program."

6. "Innovation in construction methods is one of the most powerful means of combating high costs. The Department of Education should promote strongly the development of modular systems construction. There is an urgent need for the Department of Education to provide coordination and expanded assistance in all areas of school construction, including cost savings analysis, site planning, building design, architectural planning, and a central data bank."
7. "The Department of Education should provide expert and timely guidance to the local districts and area specialists so that effective and economical transportation systems can be implemented... A procurement specialist position should be established in the Bureau of School Management Services to coordinate purchasing activities and disseminate information among Commonwealth school districts... The Task Force believes substantial improvements in the Commonwealth's school lunch program would result from the creation of a Division of Nutrition Education and School Food Services within the Department of Education."

3. Teacher Certification and Education. Reference has been made to the need to achieve the involvement of the colleges and universities, the school system and their professional personnel, and the State Department of Education through the creation of a commission under the Board of Education. Dr. Stiles found the system of teacher certification in Massachusetts to be the last developed, the most rigid and with the lowest standards. He recommends not only the development of a new set of standards through the agency of a commission and many task forces in the specialized fields of study, but the improvement of teacher education, particularly student teaching, by means of a partnership of the State Department of Education with the school systems and the colleges. The Report recommended that the Department, through the commission, develop plans, organize procedures, and disburse funds to train supervising master teachers and to free them to work with student teachers. The quality of our teaching force and the need to develop new kinds of teaching to meet the new conditions of knowledge and society urgently require the upgrading of the present bureau to a division, its proper staffing and equipping, and the establishment of a Commission.

4. Occupational Education. Reference has been made to the upgrading of the Bureau of Vocational Education to a Division of Occupational Education and the creation of a representative commission under the Board of Education named by the Board and the Board of Higher Education. Even with the assistance of federal funds, the Division is understaffed. While it has prepared master plans which are currently being revised, the plans do not reflect the basic recommendations of Schaefer and Kaufman for the radical revision of the general curriculum in our so called comprehensive high schools into a careers development curriculum centered around clusters of vocations and

using teams of teachers. Obviously such a development would involve new programs in teacher education. There has been no move to implement them either.

Neither has the Division made appreciable progress in arranging for articulated programs involving the comprehensive high schools, the vocational and regional vocational schools and the community colleges. Only one cooperative program between a community college and a vocational school is underway. No effective master plan for an articulated system of occupational education has been formulated, fully distributed and explained across the Commonwealth. While there is some excellent occupational education in Massachusetts conducted by the vocational and regional vocational schools it does not reach the masses of youth who are not preparing for college or for a job, and it is expensive. Failure to develop an articulated comprehensive and sufficient program of occupational education is largely the fault of the generality of educators and the citizens at large and only in a limited way the vocational educators.

There are a number of hopeful developments reported later, but we return to the matter of state leadership. Youth and adults across the State are not likely to be adequately or equitably served without a well prepared state plan and intelligent vigorous state leadership.

5. Adult Education. In December, 1969 Drs. Levin and Slavet submitted their report, Continuing Education in Massachusetts. If the status of elementary and secondary education is only fair, the picture for adult education is poor. At least elementary and secondary education is compulsory and must be available to all children and youth, while adult education is minimally available in Massachusetts. Only 200,000 of the 4,000,000 adults age 16 to 64 were enrolled in any kind of continuing education program in 1969. Most of these were enrolled in only one course meeting only once a week. Moreover, persons most in need of assistance are less likely to enroll in existing programs than the better educated and moderately affluent. Adult education offerings are far less than those required to meet the needs of the Commonwealth, and in many areas of the state there are not even counseling centers where adults can receive the information and assistance that they require. An assumption is widely held that once a person has left full-time schooling and has entered employment, he can and should pay the full cost of his education. The contrary is fact. Those who remain in school through high school and college have excellent prospects for a prosperous, productive life, while those who drop out of school or do not go beyond high school hold low paying jobs and can ill afford to pay for part-time adult education which was afforded free or at little cost to those who went to school full time.

The directors applied cost benefits analysis techniques to adult education and concluded that adult education programs cost little and pay off well. They estimate that the state would recapture the moderate outlay they recommend in increased taxes from increased income in from two to five years.

The directors report that the weak system of continuing education in the Commonwealth is due to low priority and the fact that there are no strong groups working to support adult education as there are for elementary and secondary education, vocational education, and education of the handicapped. As do the other studies, they identify weak leadership and make clear recommendations for increasing its strength and clarifying its responsibilities both in the State Department of Education and in the Board of Higher Education and the constituent colleges and universities under the various segmental boards. For the Board of Education, the report recommends that all adult education activities be placed in a new Division of Adult Education comprised of three bureaus. The Legislature should create a fifteen man commission under the Board of Education, six to be appointed by the Board, six by the Board of Higher Education and three appointed respectively by the Secretary for Human Services, the Secretary for Manpower Affairs and the Secretary for Administration. The new Division should divest itself to colleges and other agencies of operating programs; it should concentrate on providing statewide leadership and extending program counseling, consultation and advice in continuing education below the collegiate level.

The study recommends specific funding and expanding adult education programs below and at the higher education level in ten different programs. The increased cost to the state the first year would be \$13,230,000, at the fifth year it would be \$32,100,000, and when it is in full operation at the end of ten years, its increase would have fallen back to \$19,425,000.

6. Pupil Personnel Services. In December, 1969 the Council received the report on the yearlong study of pupil services in Massachusetts directed by Drs. Liddle and Kroll. The services identified are attendance supervisors, counselors, school adjustment counselors, social workers, speech and hearing therapists, psychologists and school nurses. The study found that while there were a few excellent, well coordinated and staffed pupil service programs in the State, most school systems had insufficient services improperly conceived and coordinated.

The Directors make clear that pupil services are not auxiliary services, incidental to the educational process, but that they are equal in importance with instructional services. "A comprehensive program of pupil services contributes to the overall educational process by helping each individual gain insights needed for better understanding of himself, for understanding of and adjustment to the society in which he lives, for developing the flexibility and resiliency that are so valuable in coping with a changing society, and for choosing wisely among educational, career and leisure opportunities." Too often pupil services consist of little more than counseling college bound students about admission to college and of encouraging the pupil to adjust to the school and society environment as it is. Seldom are all of the services available and coordinated to meet the needs of the pupil, and seldom do they act as agents on behalf of the pupil transmitting to teachers and administrators the information which would cause the school to change and improve.

"Pupil services must expand from a problem-centered to a prevention-oriented approach."

The study directors attributed much of the lack of coordination and adequacy to the fact that, "Leadership in the form of strong State Department of Education has never been available to pupil services in Massachusetts." This is so because there is a diffusion of responsibility for the various services, extending not only throughout the Department but also into the Departments of Health, Mental Health and the Division of Youth Services. Massachusetts is one of only three populous, industrial states that has not unified its pupil services in a bureau or division.

Thus one more study attributes weakness in an important phase of education to the weakness and lack of cohesion of state leadership. The report recommends the gathering together of all pupil services into a bureau in the State Department of Education. Within five years the bureau should be elevated to the status of a division. The study recommends that the Commissioner appoint a task force to develop and recommend plans for the new bureau and that an adequate coordinating mechanism be established to relate higher and lower education and the other departments of state government. (This could well be a legally established commission, such as those recommended in the teacher certification and vocational education studies.) Because it is unlikely that the Department could employ enough high level specialists, the study recommends that the Department develop a "consulting structure whereby leaders from exemplary school districts and universities, employed by the State on a per diem basis for up to 30 days a year, would be available to school districts." At its March meeting the Board of Education voted to establish a Bureau of Pupil Personnel Services, though it lacks the resources to do so. And to date no one has been designated in the Department under the Associate Commissioner for Curriculum and Instruction to undertake the planning and other steps necessary. Upon completion of the study, representatives of the various groups and associations constituting the pupil services workers formed the Interprofessional Committee on Pupil Services. Meeting several times, that Committee has prepared plans for supporting legislation to properly staff and support pupil services in the Department of Education and to plan and organize the new bureau.

7. Education of the Culturally Deprived. In April, 1969 Dr. Daniel C. Jordan of the University of Massachusetts submitted his study of Compensatory Education in Massachusetts: An Evaluation with Recommendations. He reported that there are over 135,000 children in the Commonwealth who have backgrounds which did not prepare them for successful performance in traditional schools. Almost the whole effort to assist these children is financed by Title I Federal Funds aggregating over \$16,000,000 in 1969. In 1968 these funds supported 466 projects in 305 school systems in which were enrolled over 100,000 pupils. Many of these programs are part time during the year or operate only during the summer. The average cost per pupil of these additional efforts is under \$160 a year. Dr. Jordan's major conclusion is that the compensatory (Title I) programs were "...not producing

significant results of lasting value in sufficient number of students fast enough to deal with a problem that has already reached vast proportions ..." While compensatory education is intended to "compensate" for the different and insufficient background of culturally deprived children -- for the "hidden" curriculum that they missed -- it fails because the programs are cast into a remedial mold or put into the form of general enrichment activity, "neither of which can compensate for inadequate preparation for school".

The report listed 48 recommendations clustered in four basic courses of action. They are to:

- . define objectives focused on the development of competent learners.
- . establish a system for evaluating how well programs achieve these objectives.
- . identify models of successful programs so that localities may have living demonstrations of better approaches.
- . establish model teacher training programs to meet the serious shortages of manpower in compensatory education programs.

To implement courses of action and the recommendations, the report concluded that, "...strong leadership in the State Department of Education is absolutely essential..." Should it not be forthcoming then "...there is no hope of providing equal educational opportunities to the State's disadvantaged children." Fortunately, federal law provides that all Title I programs must be approved by the State Department of Education. The funds are channeled through the Department. Fortunately also, one percent of the federal funds may be retained by the State Department of Education to support administrative costs. While the \$160,000 available is not enough, it can go a long way if it is used to employ qualified staff as recommended. Unfortunately, as in all other cases, staff must be classified and paid under the standards of the Division of Administration and Finance (the problem of salary flexibility). Many of the most important recommendations are charged to the State Department of Education and its Title I Office. Also the Board of Higher Education "should insist that schools of education in state colleges and universities give ...priority to training compensatory education personnel and evaluation specialists to fill the manpower shortage in these areas". Money is being wasted; more important children's chances are being missed. This extensive report lays out a clear program which, with state leadership, can improve the education and prospects of over 100,000 children.

8. Education of the Emotionally Handicapped. In December, 1969, the Council received the report of the Evaluation of Selected Aspects of Project 750, Massachusetts' Program for the Education and Treatment of Emotionally Disturbed School Age Children conducted by Dr. Herbert J. Hoffman of Brandeis University. Massachusetts' "750 Program" is one of the most generous in the nation. In 1968-69, \$8,000,000 of state funds supported services for over 2,400 disturbed children,

1,200 in private, mostly residential programs and 1,200 in special education programs in public schools. There were 1,700 on the waiting list. Many of these children spend two or more years in residential programs costing in excess of \$8,000 a year per child. The study found that the program is child rather than family oriented, that upon return there is a "crisis" for which neither the home, the school, nor the community is prepared. The result is a too high incidence of residivism. The study contends that the staffing of the program is the "woefully inadequate" (state leadership and services). At present the Division of Special Education in the Department of Education has only two full-time persons and a few part-time persons to plan, supervise and administer this program.

Principal among the many recommendations is the establishment of seven regional coordinators to work in the established Mental Health Regions. These coordinators should have doctorates and be qualified in special education, clinical assessment and treatment of the emotionally disturbed child. The study stresses the need for coordination between the Department of Education and the Department of Mental Health, but does not make clear the organization and administrative provisions to assure it. Perhaps a commission similar to those described under vocational education, teacher certification and adult education is a plausible solution.

9. The Boston School System. In 1969, at the urging of the Boston School Committee, which contributed \$12,000 to the effort, the Council developed a study of the Boston School System in contrast to the Council's usual statewide studies. Aided also by the Danforth Foundation and the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity the resources of this study aggregated in excess of \$100,000. Dr. Joseph M. Cronin of Harvard University, its Director, reported to the Council and the Boston School Committee in September, 1970.

Though the study's major thrust was an analysis of the policies and processes by which the Boston schools are organized, administered and instructed, it, like all others, observed the inadequacy of state funding and called for stronger state leadership and services for the beleaguered Boston System. Specifically the Report recommended that:

- . "...state officials should plan for a minimum of 90% state financing of education by the middle or late seventies, financed by a shared federal tax revenue and by a revised state income tax..."
- . Massachusetts should revise the state aid formula to recognize the municipal overburden and the greater costs of the central city school systems.
- . The state should, even in the absence of aid formula revision, supplement federal aid for disadvantaged children based on family income. This should be the core of a system of "urban grants" to cities for education.

The Boston Study recommends that Title I funds for compensatory education should be concentrated and increased to more than \$250. per pupil. They are insufficient for Boston and for the Commonwealth and should be strongly supplemented by state and local funds as recommended above.

In addition to state funding, the Boston Study observes that, "The state plays a critical role in relation to schools. Boston planners began to negotiate school construction proposals with state building and racial imbalance specialists. Federal aid comes to Boston through the state for library books, vocational education, program innovations, planning, and compensatory education.

- . The state should strengthen its capability to serve the urban school districts and children by developing a state bureau of pupil services.
- . The state should appropriate adequate funds for programs for the academically talented, for art, music, and the humanities, for dyslexia, and other special needs.
- . The state should play a central role in establishing school lunch programs for all city children by the mid-1970's.
- . The state should be the broker and disseminator of useful ideas and exemplary methods developed by experimental schools under state support, under Title III programs, and the Model Cities venture, which has, as its purpose, improving the delivery of social services such as education and health."

The Boston study notes the unique and critical problems of the central city - the marked change in the nature of the population, the stubborn persistence, even the growth of poverty sections and the culturally deprived and of the municipal overburden of operating a central city and providing services for the surrounding suburbs and the state as a whole. Indeed these are the reasons why the Council organized and funded the study which it hopes will have applicability to other large cities in the Commonwealth. The study reports the considerable failure of the Boston School System to respond to the changing need - not as a criticism of those who manage and teach in the schools but because of the rapidity of change and the rigidity of the existing bureaucracy. The study recommends a marked decentralization of administration, the greater involvement of teachers and parents in planning and policy formation, and the streamlining and reorganization of much of the structure of the school system. Though real efforts are underway to meet varying needs, the system operates on a traditional basis of fairness -- all shall have the same opportunities but such a system is unlikely to meet the needs of many of the populations. The Boston School Committee is urged to spend less of its energies on personnel matters and the structure of the bureaucracy and more on representing the people in policy formation and delivery. To make the School Committee more representative, the study recommends that it be expanded to nine members, six representing areas of the city and three elected at large or appointed by the Mayor.

IV AN EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENT

In the Big Change Frederick Lewis Allen explains that America has bypassed communism and become the most free and productive society in the World through the balanced channeling of power of big Labor, big Business and big Government. Today big Military must be added and big Education through the efforts of the National Education Association and its related organizations for elementary-secondary education and the American Council on Education and its related associations for higher education. C. Wright Mills in his Power Elite describes how these "power pyramids" interrelate and govern.

Are the "power pyramids" in Massachusetts parallel in strength to the nation's as a whole? Are they as powerful and in balance as in comparable states? There is evidence that, while in given years one power pyramid or another exerts the force to accomplish a breakthrough in policy and spending, year in and year out the various establishments are not as effectively interrelated and powerful as the Federal ones. These local establishments are chiefly successful in blocking new proposals in the numbers of which Massachusetts ranks so high.

The result of these conditions is not lower expenditures for the people, but an imbalance of programs-- high expenditures for fire, and police protection and health and welfare and low expenditures for education and highways-- and the heaviest reliance upon local property taxes. In contrast to the last most other large industrial states have more broadly based state taxes. As a rule, the higher the proportion of education costs borne by the state, the higher the percentage of per pupil costs are of the per capita income and the stronger the State Department of Education. Lacking better measures, it is probable that education services are better and more equitably distributed in states which devote a higher portion of their resources to education.

In this context what of the Massachusetts Education Establishment? We have reported on the deficiency of State Leadership, both through state fiscal support of local school and the State Department of Education. May it not be presumed that a sufficiently well organized, articulated and dynamic Education Establishment would assure more state aid in schools, perhaps an average of 50%, and adequate support and sufficient freedom for the State Department of Education to render effective state leadership and service?

The Massachusetts Education Conference Board is an association of most of the educational associations of the state. In 1965, with considerable financial assistance from the Superintendents Association, it was generally credited with uniting and engendering support for the New England School Development Council equalization state aid formula. Since then the Board has met regularly and concerned itself, among many subjects, with improvement of state funding, the State Department of Education, Teacher Certification, Vocational Education, and the role of the Secretary for Educational Affairs.

But the Conference Board has no staff or office (the MTA does provide secretarial and mailing services), and it does not have in its membership the full range of all associations who have prime interest in education. (The Massachusetts Federation of Teachers, The Education Committee of the League of Women Voters, pupil services workers, citizens for public education groups, etc.) Nor is it representative of public higher education or even coordinative with it. Nor do the constituent educational associations appear to be vigorous in well-organized support for clear educational goals. While the Massachusetts Teachers Association does have competent staff, considerable resources, a good record of support for higher teachers salaries, and a strong teacher position in collective bargaining, there is little evidence that it is responsible for any other major legislative advance for education. The Massachusetts Association of School Committees has a strong recent record in bringing about the defeat of legislation which would limit the authority of local school committees to govern their school systems and to maintain their authority to set and achieve their budgets. The Massachusetts Association of Superintendents is making a hard effort to clarify its role and the status of superintendents. The Massachusetts Association of Secondary School Principals has recently issued an excellent clarifying statement of the role of secondary principals. But all of these are early and unrelated efforts.

With great inequalities of educational opportunity and generally low State support for education, Massachusetts is weak in many areas: pupil services, adult education and broad curricular offering. There appears a clear need for a strong Education Establishment to focus upon all educational needs of Massachusetts' citizens, relating them in priority and marshalling the support for meeting them. Lacking a powerful Board of Regents and its State Department of Education, as in New York State, it appears that Massachusetts needs a stronger, more comprehensive Education Establishment whose leadership is coordinated and spearheaded through an expanded Education Conference Board with its own office and a small but distinguished staff. Dr. Gibson makes this recommendation in the Department of Education Study. It should be an organization which represents its constituent organizations, strengthening them all through shared purpose and resources, but leaving each free to pursue its unique goals.

These observations reflect the influence of localism and privatism which are the social and political conditions of Massachusetts Society. They do not imply the limitation of local control where it works; they do suggest that the size and complexity of our society and its problems require state leadership and resources which were not required in an earlier simpler society. They do ask whether our present practices, residual of our outstanding past and resulting in relatively unplanned allocation of programs and resources, do not continue inequalities and weaken the quality of life and the economy of the State. These observations are not criticisms of the able, conscientious people who serve the various associations under existing goals and conditions. Indeed the Advisory Council expresses its appreciation to the officers of those associations and of the Conference Board

who have so freely given time and talent in advising the Council and in assisting to assure dissemination of its studies' findings and implementation of their recommendations.

V PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

There is a brightening spot in the grim picture of education in the Commonwealth. That spot is the tremendous effort which the Governor and the Legislature are making in behalf of the people to build and staff a good and sufficiently large system of public higher education. Until a few years ago, Massachusetts depended almost entirely upon its private colleges and universities to educate its talented young people. The University of Massachusetts had not been many years out of the status of a state college. The first community college was founded in an old high school building only in 1960. The state had pioneered in the 1830's in creating normal schools, but these normal schools-become-teachers' colleges languished under the control of the Department of Education; their budgets were low and their reputations undistinguished. The state's per capita expenditure for public higher education was the lowest in the country -- less than half that of the next highest state.

The increasing aspirations of the people of Massachusetts for college education for their children, the high cost of private higher education, and the inability of private higher education to expand to meet the needs, set about a chain reaction of which the Commonwealth can be proud. During the past ten years the state's annual increase in its appropriation for public higher education has ranked it constantly among the top five states. Massachusetts' 68% increase during the past two years ranks it second only to Hawaii. The operating budget for the current year is \$135,492,000, an increase of 27% over last year. The appropriation for capital outlay to construct higher education facilities for the current year is \$253,000,000. The medical school at Worcester is in operation. The new campus for the University of Massachusetts, Boston, is under construction with \$80,000,000 available for this year. Six new community college plants are now under construction, and construction will begin on two more this year with sixty million dollars in new funds appropriated for construction. Community colleges operating budgets aggregate \$20,000,000, a 38% increase over last year. Last year's total public higher education enrollment of over 66,000, 6,000 above 1968-69, has increased 9,000 to 75,000 this year.

With support at these levels the colleges and the universities are not only growing rapidly in size, but they are growing in quality. While citizens and legislators can be proud of this effort, they must face the fact that statistics of the Board of Higher Education indicate that there will be 216,000 full-time students clamoring for admissions to our public colleges and universities by 1980 -- these in addition to all that the private colleges can accommodate. The people and the legislators must note that even with our tremendous ten year effort our per capita expenditure for public higher education is only \$20.62, which ranks us 49th among the states, ahead only of New Hampshire.

A true system of public higher education is emerging headed by the Board of Higher Education. That Board is making its chief effort

this year the development of a master plan for all higher education in the Commonwealth. In addition, in accordance with law, it receives the budgets from the boards governing the various segments, reviews them and submits them with its recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature. A third important responsibility of the Board is to send visiting teams of scholars to all independent schools and colleges which seek to amend their charters to offer degrees or new degree programs. The Collegiate Authority Committee of the Board has reviewed 16 visiting committee reports in the past two years before recommending approval to the Board. The Board also has the responsibility of approving all new programs offered in the 27 public colleges and universities in the Commonwealth.

The Board of Higher Education has made a significant beginning in its first four years. In order to maintain its up-coming master plan with an annual review so that it remains current as a basis of information for state officials and governing boards and to continue its other functions, the Board requires a markedly increased staff and the fiscal flexibility to use its funds as it sees fit. With capital funds expended in excess of \$200,000,000 a year and operating budgets moving toward \$200,000,000 a year, the Board of Higher Education must have the tools to assure the planning and coordination with which it is charged.

The Board of Trustees of State Colleges has created the position of provost and appointed to it a distinguished expert in higher education and has expanded its small staff. At the request of the state college presidents and the Board of Trustees of State Colleges, the Advisory Council on Education is conducting this year an in depth study of the eleven state colleges and the system to which they belong to clarify the role which these colleges play and to reveal the structure and resources which they will need to play it.

The very real credit and the hope for the future derive from the gross thrust during the last few years in the building of facilities, the employing of faculties and the admitting of students. It also derives from the efforts by an underfunded and understaffed Board of Higher Education to develop a master plan for public higher education related to all higher education. Our higher education system is a system-in-becoming. It has yet to develop all of the programs needed by our people and our state society. Moreover, several of the Council's studies, among them Teacher Certification and Teacher Education, Vocational Education and Adult Education specifically underline the absences or weaknesses of teacher education programs and educational services, research and leadership in our total system of higher education and particularly in our public system. Not only are there no or miniscule programs for the education of teachers in such areas as education of the culturally deprived, vocational education and adult education, but except in our system of community colleges, opportunities for adult continuing education are very limited, and all must pay for themselves through student fees. The Council is informed that there is no program for the preparation of social workers in any of our public colleges and uni-

versities! In our great effort to catch up and to provide for students, we must look upon our system as a young, beginning one. We must remember our per capita effort ranks us only 49th; our effort as a percent of our personal income ranks us a distant last. We need not only buildings and faculty and a new medical school. We need many new and improved programs in many of our scattered colleges and universities.

VI STUDIES UNDER WAY

The Council looks forward to its long delayed study of school district reorganization directed by Dr. Donald T. Donley, former Dean of the School of Education at Boston College, to be reported in January. Several of the Council's studies, most emphatically the pupil personnel services studies and the study of the Business Task Force, have underlined the inability of many of our small communities to make available the whole range of quality education and services required by our youth. Regionalization at the high school level partially meets these deficiencies, but it also fragments education creating a gap between elementary and secondary education. Also in January Dr. Lloyd S. Michael, Professor of Education at Northwestern University and former Superintendent of the noted Evanston Township High School, will report on his year long study of comprehensive high schools in the Commonwealth. This study is particularly significant following the recommendations of the vocational education study and the pupil personnel services study. Like those of adult education and vocational education, it surveys a major segment of our educational system. In February, Dr. Burton Blatt of Syracuse University and former Assistant Commissioner for Mental Health, will report on his year long study on education of handicapped children in the Commonwealth. This study extends the study of the education of the mentally handicapped and of the culturally deprived and makes an effort to identify handicapped children who are not in school or are not in programs helpful to them.

During the current year the Council has funded three important studies and contemplates a fourth. It has engaged Dr. Richard R. Rowe of Harvard University, to direct a fourteen month study of early childhood education in the Commonwealth. The study has two thrusts. The first is to examine the needs of pre-kindergarten children and the scope of programs available to them. Largely funded by private or federal funds, these programs are irregularly available and are not presently part of a carefully developed state plan. The second thrust is the rapidly expanded kindergarten program which must be available to all children by 1973 and the articulation of that program with pre-kindergarten programs and the first grades.

The Council has engaged Mr. Nelson W. Aldrich of the firm of Campbell, Aldrich & Nulty, Architects, to gather a qualified staff to examine the planning and building practices of our public school systems. While the study will examine the range of programs, it will concentrate on the feasibility of applying building systems, aggregating several communities into a single market, and compressing the time it takes to plan and to build.

For the first time the Council will examine one of the systems of our complex of public colleges and universities. Upon request of the presidents of our state colleges and with the approval of the Board of Trustees of State Colleges, the Council has commissioned Dr. Evan R. Collins, Professor of Higher Education at Boston College

College and former President of New York State University at Albany, to examine the eleven state college severalty and all of them as a system under the Board of Trustees of State Colleges. On the one hand, the rapidly developing system of community colleges has a clear mandate. On the other hand, the rapidly growing system of state universities is fulfilling increasing needs of the Commonwealth. It appears to the Council time to clarify the role of the state colleges which educate more of our youth than do any other segments of public higher education.

It is fruitless to attempt to assess and approve our school systems if the top agencies of leadership and policy making are frustrated and weakening. There appears some evidence that school committees have less options open to them now than ten or twenty years ago. They and their chief executive officers, the superintendents, are finding themselves increasingly pressed between the growing power of teachers and students on the one hand, and the concern and demand for accountability of the general public on the other. The Council anticipates that it will develop a limited study to appraise forces playing upon our top school leaders and policy makers and to explore whether a major study of the politics of education should be undertaken in 1972.

VII PROBLEMS AND PLANS FOR 1972

It is difficult to determine just what the budget for the Council's studies should be. Four years ago the Council determined that a minimum of three hundred thousand dollars a year for studies would justify the overhead of the Council and over a period of years would develop a significant body of information, analysis and recommendations concerning our total system of public education and its subsystems. As has been noted earlier, the total research funds available in Massachusetts probably aggregate less than 4/100 of one percent of local and state funds spent on our public schools and colleges. With a different mandate and increased staff, the Council could conduct more studies in greater depth. The question is whether, with the present condition of state leadership, more studies could bring effective profit to our schools and colleges. It is probable that before a marked increase of funds for Council studies is effected the research budgets of the various education boards should be markedly increased to do a continuing kind of research which is not the province of the Council.

The Council does find that inflation, increasing costs of consultants, and increasing costs of overhead of contracting institutions, have reduced the scope of its studies by about 25% of those produced in 1968. Secondly, the Council has found that it has underestimated the demand for its study reports. Several are already out of print. Four times the Council has had to allow moderate increases in a contract to assure printing of more copies of the reports than had originally been estimated. In some cases the Council has been able to arrange for the private reprinting of its reports. However, it is now clear that, aside from inflation, the study budgets must carry a larger proportion for printing and disseminating study reports and summaries. In consequence, the Council is requesting a minimum of \$350,000 to conduct studies in 1972, \$60,000 more than the \$290,000 available this year.

A. Studies in 1972

In 1972 the Council contemplates mounting a study either of education in our primary grades, extending the early childhood education study, or a study of the junior high school-middle school grades, extending downward the study of the comprehensive high schools. Thus, in two more years the Council hopes to have conducted a major survey of our elementary-secondary school programs from kindergarten through high school.

This year the Council is conducting its first major study of one of the systems of public higher education -- that of the state colleges. In 1972 it contemplates mounting the study of one of the other systems or a study of the personnel services, practices and activities available to students in our college and university system. Either study would be worked out in consultation with the Board of Higher Education to assure that it supports and extends that Board's efforts to develop a comprehensive master plan for higher education.

It is now time for the Council to mount penetrating and sophis-

ticated studies of the nature, extent, and quality of the curriculums and instruction in our elementary and secondary schools. Such studies must aim to get inside the classroom and to appraise the quality and condition of education and the response of the children and youth. At present the staff is working on a plan to study the degree to which certain modern science curriculums are used in our schools and to identify methods by which their use can be extended through all of the schools.

Preliminary findings and tentative recommendations of the yet to be reported study of school district organization and findings and recommendations of the Business Task Force for School Management indicate that Massachusetts should have a master plan for school district reorganization, or as the task force calls it, school district cooperation. This plan should include all communities in the Commonwealth and suggest alternatives for assuring that all of the children in all of the communities receive all of the education and school services which they require and which children and youth receive in some of our school systems in the Commonwealth. The Department of Education should be staffed to assist the communities in the state in voluntarily achieving the solutions for a period of from five to ten years. At the end of that period, the state should take whatever action is necessary to assure proper education for all. Such master plans have been prepared in a number of states, and a number of states have made remarkable progress in fulfilling them. The Council is contemplating commissioning the preparation of such a plan.

During the remainder of 1971, the Council anticipates mounting a modest, exploratory study of the problems of school policy and decision making and the forces which play upon them. Should this study be fruitful and lay out directions, the Council, in collaboration with the School Committees Association and the Superintendents Association, would mount a major study of the politics of education in 1972.

It is probable that the studies listed above would utilize all available study funds. Yet there is another problem which needs early examination and the developing of a comprehensive state plan. Several of the Council's studies, most notably that of the Business Task Force for School Management, have reported that our school committees and their administrators and the boards of education lack the management and instructional information with which to make appropriate appraisals and upon which to base the plans and programs. There are already in unrelated operation a number of education data systems, including that of the State Department of Education, which so far is supported almost entirely by federal funds. On the one hand, there exists the technical knowledge and equipment with which to create an adequate network of education data systems. On the other hand, the creation of such systems which do not develop from the expressed need and understanding of the users is unwise and has failed in a number of states. Using members of the Business Task Force for advisers, the Council is exploring the feasibility of developing a study which would develop an inventory of information and systems now in use and a plan for the gradual development of regional systems properly related into a state system.

Finally, there can be no question of the changes that are taking place in our colleges and universities in the attitude of students toward their education and their relationships with their teachers and administrators. Neither can there be any question that these changes are now apparent in our high schools and even in our junior high schools. A year ago a committee of the Massachusetts Teachers Association approached the Advisory Council concerning the development of a study of relationships between students and teachers. In the past year, the Council has explored the possibility of a study with a nationally prominent agency of one of our great universities. The Council continues to explore the possibility of conducting such a study. It believes that a study of the relationships mentioned could go to the heart of one of the most pressing problems which is almost new in our history of education. Such a study could inform school systems concerning possible steps and relationships which might avoid serious problems in the future. They could assist school systems to become stronger, more productive places of learning. If all of the studies contemplated above were undertaken the Council's study budget would have to be at least \$500,000.

Finally, the Council stresses the fact that it is constantly consulting with school people, scholars and education leaders. It is grateful for the freedom which it has had to reappraise its plans and to change them when a problem or an issue arises which seems to be of more importance than others which the Council had planned. Thus it is possible that some other study than those listed above may be mounted in 1972.

MACE Studies Contracted Fiscal 1968

<u>Title</u>	<u>Director</u>	<u>MACE Funding</u>	<u>Date Accepted by MACE</u>
Occupational Education for Massachusetts	Carl Schaefer Jacob Kaufman (Northeastern)	\$ 93,400.00	November 1968
Teacher Certification & Preparation in Mass.	Lindley J. Stiles (Boston University)	73,000.00	July, 1968
Economics of Education - Phase III Cost Purpose Analysis of General Purpose State School Aid Formulas in Mass. Preliminary Report	Andre Daniere (NESDEC)	7,000.00	February, 1968
Metropolitan Boston Area Higher Education Needs Study	Michael Anello (B.C. for Board of Higher Education)	7,000.00	May, 1968
First Phase of Adult Educa- tion Study	Anita Martin	10,000.00	June 1968
First Phase of Education Data System Study	Information Management, Inc.	15,000.00	December, 1968
A Survey, Analysis & Proposal for Action for the Development of the Visual Arts in Public Higher Education	Sam Hunter (Worcester Art Museum for Board of Higher Education)	20,000.00	January, 1969
The Measurement of Alternative Costs of Educating Non-Public School Children in Public Schools	Andre Daniere	4,479.00	April, 1969
Total		\$229,879.00	

Studies Contracted For Fiscal 1969

<u>Title</u>	<u>Director</u>	<u>MACE Funding</u>	<u>Study Received by MACE</u>
Pupil Services for Mass. Schools	Gordon Liddle Arthur Kroll (Clark University)	\$ 75,000.00	December, 1969
Continuing Education in Mass.: State Programs for the Seventies	Melvin Levin Joseph Slavet (Triton Foundation)	48,000.00	December, 1969
Take a Giant Step: Evaluation of Selected Aspects of Project 750	Herbert Hoffman (Brandeis University)	18,600.00	December, 1969
Guidelines for Planning and Constructing Community Colleges	Bruce Dunsmore (Daniel, Mann Johnson & Menden Hall)	13,250.00	November, 1969
Compensary Education in Mass.: An Evaluation with Recommendations	Daniel Jordan Katherine H. Spies (U. of Mass.)	50,000.00	April, 1969
The Mass. Department of Education: Proposals for Progress in the 70's	John S. Gibson (Lincoln-Filene Center, Tufts University)	32,500.00	October, 1970
Problems of School District Organization	Donald T. Donley (Boston College)	33,500.00	(January, 1971)
A Cost Benefit Analysis of General Purpose State School Aid Formulas in Mass.	Andre Daniere (NESDEC)	4,000.00	June, 1960
Total		\$277,400.00	

Studies Contracted for Fiscal 1970

<u>Title</u>	<u>Director</u>	<u>MACE Funding</u>	<u>Study Received by MACE</u>
Report of the Massachusetts Business Task Force for School Management	Warren King Associates (AIM)	\$ 75,000.00	September, 1970
Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity	Joseph M. Cronin (McBer and Co.)	47,000.00	October, 1970
The Comprehensive High School	Lloyd Michael (NESDEC)	100,000.00	(January, 1971)
Study of Educational Opportunities for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Children	Burton Blatt (Syracuse)	55,400.00	(January, 1971)
	Total	\$277,400.00	

Supplementary Funding

Value of services of loaned executives (AIM)	\$200,000.00
Federal funds for manuals (Board of Ed.)	15,000.00
Other donated funds and services (AIM)	20,000.00
Danforth Foundation-Boston Study	32,000.00
Boston School Committee	12,000.00
U.S. Office Economic Opportunity	10,000.00
Office of Planning and Program Coordination	
Special Education Study	4,000.00
	<hr/>
Total	\$293,000.00
Total Value of 1970 Studies	\$560,000.00

MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Members of the Council

Mr. Philip C. Beals, Chairman of the Advisory Council, Trustee,
Worcester
Mrs. Mary Warner, Vice-Chairman of the Advisory Council,
Engineer, Sunderland
Mr. Hazen H. Ayer, Chairman of the Board, Standish, Ayer and
Wood, Inc., Boston
Dr. Morton R. Godine, Vice-President, Market Forge Company,
Everett
Mrs. Shirley R. Lewis, Attorney, Lewis & Lewis, Taunton
Mr. Walter J. Ryan, Business Manager, International Union of
Operating Engineers, Local No. 4, Roslindale
Dr. Nina E. Scarito, Obstetrician, Methuen
Dr. John L. Sprague, Senior Vice-President, Research & Development,
Sprague Electric Company, Worcester
Mr. Verne W. Vance, Jr., Attorney, Foley, Hoag & Elliot, Boston

Ex Officio Members

Dr. Neil V. Sullivan, Commissioner of Education
Dr. Edward C. Moore, Chancellor of Higher Education

Legislative Consulting Committee

Mary L. Fonseca, Senator, Fall River
Kevin B. Harrington, Senator, Salem
John M. Quinlan, Senator, Dover
William L. Saltonstall, Senator, Manchester
Robert A. Belmonte, Representative, Framingham
George Rogers, Representative, New Bedford
Paul J. Sheehy, Representative, Lowell
Thomas C. Wojtkowski, Representative, Pittsfield

Council Staff

Dr. William C. Gaige, Director of Research
Dr. Allan S. Hartman, Associate Director
Dr. Ronald B. Jackson, Associate Director

